Magistrate's Court at Minachil, that for some time after that representation there was a First Class Magistrate's Court there, that subsequently a Second Class Magistrate alone was being sent, and that the people therefore experienced great difficulty in the conduct of their First class cases by having to go to Kanjirapalli, Kottayam or Perumpavur. He, therefore, prayed that the Magistrate sent to Minachil might be one with First Class powers. He further observed that the volume of crime in the taluk being large, the hands of the Police should be strengthened by the appointment of a separate Circle Inspector for the taluk. The Member also repeated the old request for making Ramapuram a charging station.

Dewan's reply.—The question of investing the Tahsildar of Minachil with First Class powers will be considered. The Peishkar and the High Court say that a First Class Magistrate is not necessary there. The Commissioner of Police says that a Circle Inspector is unnecessary at Minachil; there are only 17 Circle Inspectors for 34 taluks. A second charging station has been arranged to be opened. The question of making Ramapuram a charging station will be considered.

44. Desirability of establishing a Magistrate's Court at Kuttattukulam.

Mr. Avira Mathai (Member, Muvattupuzha Taluk) said that he had represented the subject in person to the Dewan during his last tour and that he had kindly promised to give a Bench Magistrate for the present. The Member submitted that Kuttattukulam was 12 miles from Muvattupuzha and 16 miles from Ettumanur and that it was the centre of the taluk with an important market and a Police Station, an English School, and a Sub-registry office. The absence of a Magistrate's court was being keenly felt by the people who suffered petty inconveniences and annoyances. The distance from Piravam to Muvattupuzha was 22 miles. He understood that some Magisterial reforms were under contemplation and requested that their prayer might be considered in that connection.

Dewan's reply.—The matter will be examined.

45. Need for further provisions in the Municipal Regulation to facilitate Municipal administration.

Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai B. A. & B. L. (Member, Municipal Council, Kottayam) prefaced his observations by admitting that the Municipal Regulation, V of 1095, being quite new, it was premature to offer effective criticism with regard to its operation. The comments which he offered were therefore meant only to clear the ground and to have certain patent *lacunae* filled up before the Regulation itself was set to regular working. Proceeding, the Member invited attention to Sections 53 and 58, the former relating to the vesting of properties, and the latter defining the obligations of a Municipality. It was doubtful whether public wells vested in Municipalities. Public streets were vested in Municipalities under Section 53. But with reference to the definitions of "public street" and "street" in the Regulation, and of "public" in the General Clauses Regulation, he pointed out that the essence of a public road or street was the right of way, or the right to pass along, possessed by the public. As, according to the Land Conservancy Regulation and the ruling in 5 T. L. R. page 227, the public possessed no such right over the roads in general in the State, they were but licensees in the matter of using the public roads. The Member then referred to the prohibitory notice-boards in the vicinity of temples, &c., placing checks on the freedom of passage of the public. Whatever different sections of the public might say about those boards, he (the Member) thought that the Government were within their rights in putting them up. Since there was no public street in the State as defined in the Regulation, no such thing vested in any Municipality under Section 53, and no Municipality, he argued, was bound to maintain, light or clean any road under Section 58 as the law stood at present. Those difficulties had to be cleared up.

The Member then drew attention to Section 47 of the Regulation. The Municipalities had to pay for the land assumed under that Section. But the Municipal Councils could not appear and adduce evidence before a Land Acquisition Officer,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly